

Privy Council, the word "immediately" is essential to that phrase, and to the economy of the Act, because the phrase "within eight days preceding" or "within five days preceding" would seem to be preferable.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I think it is necessary. If it works oppressively the House of Commons will be the first to end it.

The preamble and the title were agreed to, and the Bill was reported without amendment.

THIRD READING.

On motion of Hon. Sir James Lougheed, the Bill was read the third time and passed.

JUDGES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

FIRST AND SECOND READINGS.

Bill 218, an Act to amend the Judges Act.—Hon. Sir James Lougheed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

On motion of Hon. Sir James Lougheed, the House went into Committee on the Bill. Hon. Mr. Fisher in the Chair.

On section 1—definition of "judge" made to include a president of a court:

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: This is simply a change in the interpretation. It is made to include the judge of the Exchequer Court, which is a new term we adopted this session.

Section 1 was agreed to.

On section 2—Supreme Court of Canada:

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: The salary of the Chief Justice of Canada under the present law is \$10,000. The proposed salary is \$15,000.

Hon. Mr. BOSTOCK: The \$15,000 is for other duties as well?

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: Yes. It includes the duties he will perform as Deputy Governor. So it will do away with any question hereafter as to any additional duties he may be called upon to perform.

Section 2 was agreed to.

Sections 3, 4, 5 were agreed to.

On section 6 (new section 10)—New Brunswick:

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: I want to say, with regard to judges, that I think their salaries

are fairly commensurate with the services they give to the country in most cases. I object to judges taking assignments, holding commissions, etc.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: That is provided for; that is one of the great things in this Act.

Hon. Mr. FOWLER: Then that is all right; I have nothing more to say.

New sections 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 14A were agreed to.

Section 7 was agreed to.

On section 8—Judicial Committee of the Privy Council:

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: I want to ask my honourable friend just what has been the situation in this regard during the last two or three years. It is traditional for the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to attend the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and for many years past provision has been made to cover his travelling expenses. Last year and this year the Chief Justice did not attend, but one of the other judges of the Supreme Court who is a member of the Privy Council attended the sitting, the amount necessary for his travelling expenses being voted in the Estimates. Apart from this Bill altogether, I want to ask why the Chief Justice was not chosen.

Hon. Sir JAMES LOUGHEED: I really could not tell my honourable friend. I fancy that if the Chief Justice wanted to go there would be no objection to his going.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: He was not strong enough.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: Did my honourable friend examine him medically?

Hon. W. B. ROSS: I do not need to. That is a notorious fact.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: I might be willing to take my honourable friend's word on questions of law, but I do not know whether I should take it on medical matters.

Hon. Mr. CROSBY: Take your medicine.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: I think perhaps it would be safer to take it on medicine. No affront has been put on the Chief Justice.

Hon. Mr. BELCOURT: I did not say there had been; but I wanted to know why the tradition had been departed from.

Hon. W. B. ROSS: He did not want to go.